UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Roots and Fruits—City Churches and City Hall - - - - - - *John Malick*

The Dignity of the Ministry - *R. Lester Mondale*

Toward Understanding the Pharisees - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Arthur L. Weatherly and Nebraska State Government - - *Addison E. Sheldon*

Trumpets on New Horizons
Edited by Lucia Trent

VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 4

Chicago, June, 1942

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

John Malick: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Duluth, Minn.

R. Lester Mondale: Minister of All Souls Unitarian Church, Kansas City, Missouri.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minster of the Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church, Flatbush, New York.

Addison E. Sheldon: Secretary of the Nebraska State Historical Society since 1917.

C. A. Hawley: Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

Edwin T. Buehrer: Minister of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago.

James M. Yard: Director of the Chicago Round Table of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
- Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 51
- Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 54

ARTICLES—
- Roots and Fruits—City Churches and City Hall—JOHN MALICK .. 54
- The Dignity of the Ministry—R. LESTER MONDALE 57
- Toward Understanding the Pharisees—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY .. 59
- Arthur L. Weatherly and Nebraska State Government—ADDISON E. SHELDON 61

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
- Socks—RALPH CHEYNEY 64
- Little Chinese Children—CLEM GRAHAM 64
- To a Nazi Soldier—LUCIA TRENT 64

POETRY—
- For Douglas MacArthur—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 53
- Beyond the Flames of Hate—ELOISE FORD 56

THE STUDY TABLE—
- "Dr. Will" and "Dr. Charlie"—C. A. HAWLEY 62
- "Science Is Not Neutral"—JAMES M. YARD 62
- The Return to the Church—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 62
- A Practical Gospel—C. A. HAWLEY 63
- New Wine in Old Bottles—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 63
- The Eternal Quest—C. A. HAWLEY 63
- Manual of the American Way—JAMES M. YARD 64

THE FIELD—
- Western Unitarian Conference 50

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Western Unitarian Conference

Due to curtailment of expenses, to certain fortunate investments, and to other occurrences of a financial nature, including the United Unitarian Appeal, the Conference has ended the year with its solvency somewhat improved. This together with other economies effected will enable the officers and directors not only to stay within the budgeted income of the Conference but also to devote their major attention to the purposes for which the Conference exists, without giving disproportionate time and attention to monetary matters.

During the year there have been the following resignations: Charles Wing at Denver; Robert E. Romig at Duluth; Edwin H. Wilson at the Third Church, Chicago; Walton E. Cole at Toledo; Edward W. Ohrenstein at Hinsdale; Russell E. Simmons at Evanston; Clinton Scott at Dayton, and Arthur Weatherly at Lincoln.

The notable pastorate of Arthur Weatherly at Lincoln, covering a quarter of a century, was properly celebrated by both the Lincoln Church and the Lincoln community.

Also during the year, Jacob Trapp has been settled at Denver; John Malick at Duluth; Edwin T. Buehrer at the Third Church, Chicago; Kenneth L. Patton at Madison; Daniel Sands at Sioux City, and Arthur W. Olsen at Toledo.

With the cooperation of the American Unitarian Association, Columbus, Ohio, and Flint, Michigan, have acquired parish buildings to house their various activities, and the newly established church at Beverly in Chicago has acquired a famous old castle with adequate facilities for church services and parish activities. At Beverly Lon R. Call, minister-at-large on the staff of the American Unitarian Association, has rendered invaluable service, as was also the case at Duluth. Both Don Harrington of the People's Liberal Church and Preston Bradley of the People's Church were particularly helpful in the establishment of the Beverly church. Other Unitarian churches and ministers in the Chicago area also rendered valuable assistance.

Deserving special mention are the ministers' gatherings at Iowa City, St. Paul, Ypsilanti, and particularly Turkey Run. The Lake Geneva Unitarian Institute has become a veritable Western Isles of Shoals, without which the entire Western Unitarian movement would suffer great loss. The Dean of the Institute, the Reverend Tracy Pullman, and the members of his committee have devoted much time and attention to the planning of the Institute for the summer of 1942.

——From *Annual Report of the President, Curtis W. Reese,* at St. Louis, May 11.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVIII JUNE, 1942 No. 4

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I.

It is a curious world. Here I sit in dumb amazement as I read in newspapers and listen on radios to the reiterated warnings against peace. Evidently the most dastardly thing that anybody can do just now is to suggest that this war might stop. To plead for peace, and I suppose even to pray for it, is sure sign of being a Nazi agent and a fifth columnist! Yet if Germany asks for peace, why should we not consider it? This does not mean that we have got to accept the terms she offers. On the contrary, it may well mean, if we be wise enough, that this is a chance to present our own terms. And what would that not mean in the matter of driving a wedge between the Nazi regime on the one hand and the German people on the other? Just tell the Germans on what conditions precisely we will consent to an armistice—why not? This was the very thing done with triumphant success by Woodrow Wilson in the last war. *He* was never afraid to talk peace. On the contrary, he invited negotiations, always of course on his own terms, and in due time broke down the enemy. In the present fight, I think we ought to do more than insist upon our own terms. We must now insist upon humanity's terms, which are of concern quite as much to Germans as to Englishmen, Russians, and Americans. So I am in favor of talking peace, no matter who proposes it. And in this, thank heaven, I have good company in no less a personage than the Pope of Rome. Once again has the noble Pontiff lifted up his inspired voice and begged the nations to seek peace. That this utterance from the Vatican should have been buried by the American press so effectually that most people do not know that His Holiness has spoken at all, and this at the very time when all the front pages carried Mr. Churchill's bloodthirsty speech in threat of reprisals and revenge, shows conclusively the kind of atmosphere in which we are living today. But I am determined, as are pacifists the world around, not to be stayed from the pursuit of peace. I choose to keep company with the Pope of Rome. In him at this moment I find a nearer kinship to God than in any president or premier.

II.

There is nothing surprising in Gandhi's steadfast adherence, in the face of an impending invasion of India by Japan, to his doctrine of non-violence. "What went ye out for to see? A reed shaken by the wind?" When Gandhi resigned his leadership of the All-India National Congress, he distinctly said that he "must continue [his] movement . . . against all wars, with others who believe in non-violence." The surprising thing is that the Congress should ever have abandoned this policy, to which it has just now returned. This action, as a matter of fact, was not so much an abandonment of what, under Gandhi's leadership, had become a central part of Indian life, as it was a political move in anticipation of and preparation for the coming of the Cripps mission. It was an attempt, as I see it, to establish conditions which would justify Britain in giving to India, in the face of a great military crisis, an independent national government entrusted with its own defense. Even so, it was an unworthy move which retired to private life the Mahatma who would play no such game. Also, it was an unsuccessful move, for Britain remained adamant. Now India turns back again to Gandhi, and reaffirms the principle and policy of non-violent non-cooperation. Says the Congress:

> The British Government has prevented organization of national defense by the people. . . . . The Committee therefore expect the people of India to offer complete non-violent non-cooperation to the invading forces, and not to render them any assistance. . . . . We may not bend the knee to any aggressor, nor obey his orders. . . . . If he wishes to take possession of our homes and our fields, we must refuse to give them up, even if we have to die in the effort to resist them.

This, be it noted, is *resistance*—not violent resistance, but resistance none the less effective. How the Indians could effectively offer any other is a mystery, for the people are as completely unarmed as they are untrained to arms. Such has been the policy of Britain for generations! Now, even in Bengal, with the Jap-

anese only 170 miles away, there are no weapons but lathi sticks. What is left to the people, however, is Gandhi's superb pacifist discipline. "The Indians will neither draw water nor hew wood nor work in field or factory for the invaders," writes an Indian scholar. "They will offer far more resistance than is being offered at this moment by many in Europe lying prostrate under the Nazi heel. The Japanese will never succeed in reducing the Non-Violent Non-Cooperators of India to utter helplessness." Meanwhile, the English, the Americans, and the Chinese will fight. We shall see now which is the more potent—arms or souls.

III.

It is a remarkable thing that the United States government should be engaged in the business of defining religion. Yet precisely this task has now been undertaken under the terms of the Conscription Act which declares that appeals of conscientious objectors to war must be based upon "religious training and belief." But what *is* "religious training and belief"? How may it be identified and recognized? Such questions have been causing trouble to the draft boards, and in an endeavor to clear up difficulties, General Lewis B. Hershey has recently issued a letter of instructions well deserving careful attention. In this letter, the General first of all declares that each case of conscientious objection to war "must be considered individually and that no presidential appeal decision can be considered as a binding precedent." No conscientious objector, in other words, shall be stretched upon the Procrustes bed of official rulings. Each appellant's case shall be decided on its own merits. Excellent! Here at the very start is a recognition of the essential character of conscience as an intensely individualistic phenomenon, to be reverenced as something spiritually unique and therefore sacred. General Hershey here speaks the word of all the mystics of generations past. Secondly, he declared that religious belief "contemplates recognition of some source of all existence, which, whatever the type of conception, is Divine because it is the source of all things." This definition seems at first to be more philosophical than religious—one thinks of the early Greek philosophers who talked of fire, water, and air as "the source of all existence." But this means only that General Hershey decided to err, if at all, upon the inclusive rather than the exclusive, the broad rather than the narrow, side of interpretation. In speaking of the "Divine," he introduces the spiritual element necessary to religion if it is to be central to the life of man. But the essential thing is that he would have all sincere belief recognized as religious, *"whatever the type of conception,"* which might well include the materialist as well as the theist, and certainly the Humanist. What could be wiser or juster than this? Lastly, General Hershey insists that "religious belief" is more important than "religious training." He is rightly suspicious of sudden discoveries of conscience—"the record" must somewhere "tell the story"! But the inner conviction, its nature and character, is the important thing. "Does he [the C. O.] get it? That's the question." Such is the substance of a letter which does infinite credit to its author as an enlightened man. General Hershey knows what religion is and would respect its devotees. Thus it is no accident that from the beginning, under his direction, the conscientious objectors' problem under the Conscription Act has been handled with patience, discretion, and understanding.

IV.

Is liberty to be lost in this country? That depends on whether American citizens fight to defend it, for the attack has now definitely begun. Thus, after a honeymoon period in which it seemed as though the administration were going to be scrupulous in its regard for the Bill of Rights, the Department of Justice has started a series of sedition trials. The persons involved are obnoxious and unbalanced, but that is just the type of person with whom prosecutions of this kind always start. Pick off the crackpots, the demagogues, and the weak, and then the way is cleared to handle resolute and intelligent citizens whom the government for one reason or another dislikes or fears! Furthermore, even the disreputable among us are entitled to the same protection under the law as the most respectable. Next, the Post Office Department has begun barring publications from the mails. The initial victim is Father Coughlin's *Social Justice,* for which no decent person has anything but loathing and disgust. But here again is an arbitrary process at work which may in the end destroy freedom of the press as we have long known it under the Constitution. In the last war, the process began with just such sheets as *Social Justice* and ended up with such papers as the *Saturday Evening Post,* the *North American Review,* the *Review of Reviews,* the *World's Work,* the *Masses,* the *World Tomorrow,* and our own UNITY, all of which had issues excluded from the mails. But everything else pales before the action of the War Department in taking over the control of coastal areas under the President's order of February 17th last. What was started on the Pacific coast has now been extended to the Atlantic coast, from which, by arbitrary command of the general in charge, not only aliens but citizens can be banished, and not only individuals here and there but whole populations. Any person, by due order of the Army, can be exiled inland—any group of persons, with or without military reasons, evacuated at an hour's notice. No constitutional safeguards, no court procedures, no hearings, no reasons asked or given. Let it be said, as I firmly believe, that the Army has no intention of being arbitrary or cruel, just as the Department of Justice and the Post Office have no intention of prosecuting and suppressing without due evidence.

On the west coast, for example, the conduct both of the Army and the Department of Justice has been impeccable. But the menace remains. The very process endangers liberty.

V.

There is an amusing side to this Laval business—the universal horror over this base Frenchman's seizure of power in Vichy! I join in the horror, for I think that Laval is all that he is said to be—wily, shrewd, unscrupulous, corrupt, treacherous, at heart a traitor. But I thought this a long time ago—in the years when the people who are now venomously denouncing this man were tumbling over themselves to do him honor. In those days Laval had the same lowering look that he has today; his name spelt the same way backwards and forwards then as now; he was engaged in the same nefariously crooked business that now occupies his attention. How could there be any question as to the career and character of this French statesman (so-called)? Yet England and the United States had friendly relations with him, did business with him when he was premier, and went out of their way to laud and honor him. Do we not remember, all of us, Laval's visit to this country in (I think) 1931? When he landed in New York, a host of officials and journalists were on hand to bid him welcome. When he went to Washington, he was received at the White House, and the President was the central participant in receptions and dinners given to the distinguished guest. Wherever he went, the newspapers hailed him, and leading citizens greeted him. Yet Laval was the same man then as now. What is more, we knew that he was that type of man. There was no secret about his political deviltries in France. His character was written all over his face. The liberals and radicals in this country were telling the truth about him. Yet the nation took this crook to its collective bosom—first, because he held a great public office, and secondly because we thought he could be used to our advantage. It makes me sick to recall the pretentious fuss that was made over Laval a dozen years ago, just as it similarly makes me sick to behold the equally pretentious opprobrium now heaped upon him. For there is no more sincerity in the one attitude than in the other. If there came a turn of fortune and Laval were suddenly on our side, we would honor him again.

VI.

It is amazing to discover how pacifists are able to carry on these days, not only in free but in occupied countries. Reports of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, for example, open one's eyes to the actuality of what otherwise might not be believed. Thus, a February 27th message from England, signed by Canon Raven, Muriel Lester, Vera Brittain and others, states that the British Fellowship is able to "maintain [its] work . . . pretty much on the same level as before the War." It has suffered a loss of some 500 members since September, 1939, and since that same date has gained "more than 4000" new members. In France, a Fellowship group at Le Chambon is "getting on surprisingly well." In Norway, a member of the local F. O. R. council at Stavanger, arrested as a hostage, has been now released. In Czechoslovakia, "two of our best friends are still able to conduct their religious settlement for young people and children." Theodore Walser, in Tokyo, is "in some form of custody, but treated well by the Japanese authorities." Canada reports that of all those who signed the famous Witness Against War, "only half a dozen or so have renounced their stand." All this means a vitality in the pacifist movement in wartime such as was practically unknown in the last war. Also, in the toleration of this movement, the scant persecution of pacifism as such, there is impressive evidence of growing understanding of the movement as a sincere expression of religious conviction. The Quakers, thanks to a full generation of heroic fidelity to their cause and of selfless devotion to human need in all countries, foe and friend alike, have long since won recognition and reverence, and now can carry on their work almost anywhere in the world without danger of interference. The same thing seems to be coming to pass with pacifists in general. Thanks to brave witness through the years, they have earned respect. Thanks to labors for the common good which know no self-interest, serve no faction or party, and consistently offer good for evil, they have stilled suspicion, prejudice, and fear. When one learns of pacifist groups still functioning not only in England, but in Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Czechoslovakia, one is tempted to do a lot of thinking. Christianity conquered Rome not by power, nor by might, but by the spirit. Why may not Christian pacifism conquer modern imperialism and militarism by the same sure method?

For Douglas MacArthur

(After John Milton)

MacArthur, whose name in arms through Asia rings,
  Filling her hordes with envy or with praise,
  And all her dread dictators with amaze,
To challenge her Triumvirate of kings,
Your everlasting valor ever brings
  Victory home, though new invasions raise
  Their Hydra-heads, and false Nippon displays
Her dragon shape athwart their serpent wings.

O soul of Grant, and Sherman, Sheridan,
  Stand firm against the horrible typhoon
  Beating relentlessly those ramparts high
We watch—forever wave the hopes of Man
(Our Stars and Stripes) 'til midnight turn to noon
  Under a gold-emblazoned eagle sky.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Jottings

"And good in everything," says the melancholy Jaques, in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*. Yes, good—even in war! Thus, we have heard that the gasoline rationing on the eastern coast will cut off fuel supplies to outboard motor-boats. O boy, O joy! There will be a little quiet this summer in Maine.

The Battle of the Coral Sea was described in the beginning as the greatest naval engagement of modern times. Now we know that it was a skirmish, in which neither the Allied nor the Japanese main forces were engaged. As Emerson did not read a new book until it was at least a year old, that he might not waste his time, so for the same reason we may well believe no news until it is at least a month old. Not only time but energy will thus be saved!

A poll of the editors and publishers of 500 daily newspapers throughout the country has resulted in the selection of the New York *Times* as the greatest newspaper in the world, and likewise the greatest in the United States.

News Item

This would seem to be unfair! Since the *Times* is "the greatest newspaper in the world," why should not some other paper be named "the greatest in the United States"?

Trust the Quakers to stand firm! The Arch Street and Race Street Yearly Meetings in Philadelphia have adopted a "wartime peace report," in which they protest "the entire war system and totalitarian measures that go with it as denials of both the democracy and the Christianity which we profess."

I never cease to be amazed and amused by the antics of so-called patriotism. An apartment house in New York, known as the Lindbergh Apartments, has changed its name to the MacArthur Apartments!

Under the Canon Law of the Anglican Church in England and of the Episcopal Church in this country, an ordained minister of the church cannot bear arms. Why? Think it over!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Roots and Fruits - City Churches and City Hall

JOHN MALICK

The matter at issue, in the present contest of ideas, is the relative value of man, any man, in relation to things and to all other men. Religionists find themselves all on the same side in the rating of man as an end in himself, for himself, rather than means to other men's ends. We find ourselves in agreement with religionists' basic appraisal of worth.

Some place along the line man came into the idea that he is important to the universe, as he knew it at the time. It could not have been a matter of knowledge then, it is not a matter of knowledge now. His universe alternately beat him unmercifully and showered him with benefit. A universe believed to be neutral to our values makes it even more difficult. The very conception out of which democracy stems, the unique value of man, was easier to believe when man's world seemed more accommodating to his affairs.

It is not a matter of knowledge, or social statistics, that man is precious to other men. This is not something that comes from history. It is not to be gathered from the treatment of men in Egypt, or Babylon, or Athens or Rome or London, or New York. In a world of total war, it is still more difficult to be sure of this fundamental upon which democracy rests, viz., that a man gives notice that you are in the presence of something with the universe for his defender and all men for his friends. That man has dignity and worth, sounds like the sort of thing that would come from religion's side,—neither science, nor history, nor human experience giving report so favorable.

This rating of man that gives democracy all the point it could possibly have, might have come in the special way of finding out things that religion claims as exclusively her own. That is, it might have come from revelation. We are not discussing the fact but tracing the growth of an idea. Religion gives still another possibility. It might have come as a venture of faith that man is of such worth, although the evidence is not yet forthcoming. The likelihood is increased by the fact that this basic rating of man is in the language of the church rather than in the ways of the church or of the world.

Chronologically, man was rated precious to his universe first. It was said that he is such a being as merits some provision that is eternal, beyond time and history. This longer and larger relation impressed man first. Time was an element of the value. Out of this perspective, of man dear to his world, came the thought that he ought to be as dear to all men, which is the root of the democratic way.

We are trying to believe this in a world in which any man, the whole race of men, and the earth itself, are thought to be but incidents in the march of unconscious power. Whether man would remain important to other men in a universe thought not to care, we simply do not know. That every man has such high meaning, arose when religion was men's first interest, the determiner of values and the judge of conduct. Man first became precious to man in the period when he was believed to be precious to a God. Service to man got most of its meaning from the time when man was thought to have a Friend behind the world who would be pleased for the help given to one of his.

The democratic state could not have seemed important as long as the church believed the time was short.

The better part was to endure, rather than to alleviate, the human lot. The democratic way could not seem important as long as the life of man was thought a part of a scheme, closed at both ends, with a short span between, from Eden to the last trump of judgment. This democratic conception was not a part of this order that unrolled like a scroll. This value of man functioned within the existing framework of grades and ranks of men, without thought that a being of such worth could have part in the political order in which he lived. The conception had not arrived that he should, nor the device, the vote, yet arrived by which he could.

The blind spot in the religious story is that the church code of the good life had but little in it of obligation to set up the means of realizing upon this worth that religion affirmed. There was no democratic state then in terms of which to rate conduct. Not having the vote, there was no commandment about prostituting it or selling it for two dollars. There is no parable of two irresponsibly wicked men who did not go to the polls, thereby helping that much to throw Jerusalem into the hands of those who robbed it as civic routine; no parable of two simple-minded fellows who were told to play like they are enemies, each canceling the vote of the other, throwing the city into the hands of those who with their relatives and friends ran it as private business. We are thinking of our religious tradition that gave the world the conception of democracy without giving a corresponding code that would make running a state or city democratically a part of the good life here and a condition of salvation.

One of the tests of the relation of religion to democracy is the interaction of one upon the other where most people are and where religion is best represented. The test of democracy, finally, is not in the town meeting, where it is simple, but in the city, where it is difficult. It is in the cities that we find the most influential religionists and their greatest corporate strength. Whatever the relation was at first, between the roots of democracy and religion, the relation now, between religion and the fruits of democracy, is certainly to be found in our cities. Specifically, what is the relation of religious institutions in our cities to the tool, the vote, by which democracy comes into, and holds, its own? The vote, like taxation, is practically limitless in its power to bring in or to cast out. The vote says what those who cast it want to say, have to say, no less and no more. Taking our American cities as the expression of what dwellers in them have to say with their votes, would one suspect that over half of these citizens are, nominally at least, listed in the most ethical of religions, weighing human action to the gram weight? If one should come as a stranger to our cities, familiar only with the literature of religion that goes into such minute refinements in human conduct, would one be surprised to find that these religionists are a majority in our cities? The amazing thing is that this church code has such little bearing on the conduct that makes our cities what they are, or upon the kind that would make them what they might be.

Cities, in many cases, have become so bad that their condition affected the death rate. By all the tests of evil that we know, those who ran them were bad beyond the power of most to do harm. Few with such small endowments ever in history have been able to do so much evil. Have we had any city that became so bad that all the churches stood together against it? Here are churches all having about the same theology, all believing in the eternal worth of man, all paying lip service to the democratic way. To some kinds of misbehavior they are sensitive. All descend upon City Hall on sex matters, drink, gambling, and stealing from individuals in the smaller amounts. They jump quickly to resolutions in the Ministers' Meeting; call upon the Mayor; and give the candidate who disregards them a hard run for his place. They do not hesitate to write their code of conduct into city ordinances.

With all the cases so flagrant that they have reached the courts, how many responsible for the corruption of our cities have been called to account in the confessional? How many have been "churched" by those with this method of discipline? How many have been condemned by their spiritual advisors, by their associates in the pews, or have been socially inconvenienced? We cannot answer. The confessional is privileged and all such influences might be private. In case of church disapproval of lesser evils, we are not left in such doubt. It is given the widest publicity.

It may be said for excuse that churchmen have no independence of action in judging the pews. It happens that some churchmen do not have to wait upon consent of their pews before giving judgment. On some matters they speak at once, dogmatically and fearlessly, let the results fall where they may. Such clergy have status of their own apart from authorization given them by their laymen. Their pews expect to be judged and take it. Some of the most flagrant cases of corruption of cities have been by those under churchmen who cannot be unseated by their pews. No answer has been forthcoming why authority is exercised so uniformly in matters of marriage, divorce, censorship, and church attendance, the smaller evils, and exercised so little in case of the clearer evil of undermining cities.

Other clergy are under another polity, with all authority vested in the pews. For them it would be more difficult to hold their laymen up to judgment. These churchmen are tied to one end of a contract, conditioned on their good behavior, as judged not by the clergy representing the corporate life of the church but by the laity only. The accepted good behavior is, "Hands of," whatever these laymen do to a city though it become a pesthouse of iniquity and bankrupt under the stewardship of these same laymen. Any one familiar with both the church and the political life of a city, knows just how much to expect of interference with city wrecking from either branch of the church.

The usual distribution of party organization men and officeholders in the churches practically guarantees non-interference. Any church having in it the guilty of both parties is estopped from holding either up to judgment. The difference in the influence of churches in cities as ecclesiastically different as Boston and Philadelphia, New York and "Middletown," is not as great as one would expect. The results are strikingly similar whether a city is all-American religiously, or made up "of those foreigners" with their alien ways and European religion. About the same results obtain whichever branch of the church holds the field. In all of our cities the continuance of any condition beyond the next election is by express consent of the churches that together could remedy the situation by their numerical strength at any election.

It is unfortunate that the code book of the good life was closed before the good citizen came into being in the sense that he has to be to have a democratic

city or state. The kind of bad men responsible for cities, and the kind of good men upon which cities depend, had not come into existence when the church book of rules was made and closed. Good men were busy about other obligations that went with their condition and opportunity to do either right or wrong. They did have their bad men who took cities with such means as they had, but they were rated as enemies and gave notice when they stormed in to take the city over. All good men and true were out to defend against them. This new technique of taking cities over, burrowing into their foundation in peacetime, by those of reputation within the walls—this technique had not yet come. There is no casting out of this kind of bad men or crowning this kind of good men, in gospel or creed. A thing could not have been made disgracefully bad that was not in the picture when gospel and creed were written. They embodied their time. It was passive acceptance of tyranny, a coin tossed to Caesar. There was no demand in the good life to unseat him and the whole system by which he got and kept his place.

This ineffectiveness of churches in dealing with municipal wrongdoing is not unique. A like situation exists in the field of economic wrongdoing. When the church code was closed there were no municipal sins that could be reached by those who endured them. The writers were not in position to sin against their city. They did not hold any relation to it by which they could hurt it in a large way. There were not people large enough in affairs to do economic wrong. Perhaps, there is no field in modern life in which those of such small endowments have been in position to be such conspicuous wrongdoers as those to whom our cities have been turned over. Without previous experience in government in the old world, conditioned for centuries by their little affairs of field and shop, they had had no experience with such large affairs as running our cities, nor with money in such large amounts. While other citizens could make more in other fields, managing cities was big business for those to whom it was left. Unchecked by the business efficiency all around them, unjudged by the only institution to which they ever had looked for standards, their church, it was a grand free-for-all in a field of personal aggrandizement the like of which never had come to those of their size before.

It is not that churches keep out of such things of the world, ministering spiritually only to both sheep and goats, side by side, leaving their separation to the great Judge at the end. Churchmen have a flair for getting into politics and other things of the world that excite them. The story of ecclesiastical politics in this country does not suggest that their indifference to the major evils in our cities comes from a principle of being spiritual guides only in matters spiritual, unspotted by the world. For the things that concern them, they are skillful enough as politicians and lobbyists, masters of the old tricks, adding new turns of their own.

We understand that churches may not see eye to eye with every new upstart movement in a city that calls itself reform. Often enough they are justified in withholding allegiance. It well may be just a new turn of an old trick to give the outs their turn at the city. But, here and there, cities may have those in control long enough to demonstrate their integrity beyond reasonable doubt. The evidence stands out on every street and in every city service. A city may go on for years under those who manage it in terms of benefit to those who pay the bills. It may become so clear that even the average citizen knows it with a degree of certainty that he seldom has in making his decisions. It would seem that churchmen, who make a business of moral judgment, who are thought more highly sensitized to all degrees of hurt—it would seem that they could see what is evident to the wayfaring man. But churchmen, all together, cannot be depended upon to choose the side of honest stewardship against those who have robbed a city for years. It may well be that such long practice in adjusting the eye to microscopic evils unfits the moral sight to take in larger evils evident to the naked eye. While things cannot be bad enough in a city to mobilize all churchmen against them, they cannot be made good enough under a decent administration to put all churchmen back of the better.

This does suggest something of opportunity. The salvation churches well may say that they are in larger business than helping keep cities here in order, being the authorized watchers over a more continuing city. They might consistently, and justifiably, stick to this. Those of us who cannot be salvation churches have to justify ourselves on other grounds. The encouraging thing is the small number who can change cities, or anything else, when they are stirred enough. At least they can scream their protest. There will be answering voices back to them, those who feel that way, too, and were waiting for a voice.

For a whole church, under one name, to identify itself in its entirety with the movement to take cities out of the field of private business and return them to public business, this would be a distinctive thing among American churches. Such a church would have little competition. After the present job is done of keeping a place for democracy anywhere, the first matter will continue to be living democracy where most people are and life is most difficult—in the crowded streets of our cities.

Beyond the Flames of Hate

Our minds and hearts are tense with growing fear
Because we see the world absorbed by hate.
Its blinding mist and choking fumes appear
Wherever cries of anger circulate.
The men who represent a nation's soul
Inhale an air that poisons every sense
As brutal leaders, acting out a role,
"Protect the weak"—the words of mere pretence.

But through it all our spirits push ahead
To days when sparks of hate no longer flash
Consuming flames, but fires are chilled and dead.
And healing mercy rises from the ash.
That day will consecrate a working plan
Of universal love for every man.

ELOISE FORD.

The Dignity of the Ministry

"My Pulpit Is My Throne and My Joy"—Theodore Parker

R. LESTER MONDALE

If that splendid gentleman and religious leader who once asked his most intimate friends, "Who do men think that I am?" had not had a very definite idea of his own identity, it is doubtful that he would have had the self-assurance to have used the words "but *I* say unto you" or that he would have had the self-respect which evoked inevitably the veneration with which his most intimate friends came to regard him.

So mysterious is the self and the personality that men are always pondering the question posed by Jesus. If this question is asked by the physician today he gets his answer, in so far as his social-economic status is concerned, when he is addressed as *Doctor*. Addressed as *Doctor,* he knows, socially and sociologically, exactly who he is. The same is largely true of the advocate, the pedagogue, the businessman, and the skilled worker. Each group has its Aesculapian mythology, each its derivative and mores-sanctioned fictional role and vocational "front," and each its accredited function in society. With the minister of religion, however, it is lamentably different. He has so over-emphasized the mythology of his role that he has caused it to be all too widely regarded as patently mythological in the infantile and fairy story sense of the term. He himself finds the anthropological patterns of the role assigned him distasteful. He cringes when addressed by his own parishioners as *Reverend,* but when mistaken by a stranger for a businessman or even a professor he not only feels highly complimented, he also not infrequently indulges in language innuendoes which lend credence to the error . . . particularly when he is on a vacation.

Wishing ardently to be someone other than the preacher people expect him to be, the minister thus makes himself sociologically illegitimate and his vocation nameless and fatherless. Thus, as a result more than anything else of the damning psychological effect of the insecurity of his sociological status, he calls forth from the accredited vocations nothing but the most intolerable of condescension and contempt. To avoid this condescension, or to mitigate it at least, the illegitimate seeks adoption by the vocational family which at the moment is always most vehement and vituperative in its abuse of the clergy and its mythology. When, for instance, the scientists were in their heyday during the Scopes Trial era, the ministry sought adoption in that family. Oh, to have a real honest-to-goodness scientist in the congregation or as a pulpit guest! Oh, to be able to preach an astronomical or electronic deity, to hold a psychiatric confessional, to engage in sociological reforms! But for all his family loyalties the adopted child repeatedly heard himself called an illegitimate and he never got over feeling like one.

What heaped insult upon injury was the fact that the scientist, the philosopher, the historian was a specialist, one who ostensibly knew what he was talking about, whose word carried weight. When he wrote a treatise it was published in a learned journal, or in a book, and it was regarded as a significant contribution to the future of the race. But try as he might to be a philosopher, or a historian, or psychologist, or theologian, or Bible scholar, or sociologist, or news analyst, or aesthetician, or businessman, or actor, and to study with the fury of a Theodore Parker—for to be above contempt he manifestly had to be a specialist in all the foregoing fields —the minister invariably found weightier bread-and-butter problems commandeering his energy and time. He found his duty that of helping some retired businessman—a church official, nevertheless—kill time and bury the remains of promising hours in the Church study; he found himself sweating to get a speaker at the last moment for the women's society meeting, or having to take the harp off the willows to try to play it as a second fiddle for a Service Club meeting. Thus he found his duties driving him increasingly to keep his eyes on Dorothea Dix for illustrative material for the sermon on marriage, to go to the encyclopedia for enough facts on a Bible subject to create at least an illusion of scholarship, and to editorials in the *New Republic* to give substance to a discourse on the upward looking impulse.

Revolting against their nondescript vocational status not a few of our colleagues are now determinedly reasserting the antique ministerial claims to legitimacy. These claims are based upon a reassertion of the validity of our vocational mythology and of the derivative vocational role in the community. The claim is primarily, in my opinion, not rational, but of the nature of a mental *tour de force.* But whether or not the claim has rationality is relatively unimportant. What is important to the success or failure of this new claim to legitimacy is whether or not the derivative role will function in such wise as will reflect credit upon, and therefore dignify, the ministry. The role is supreme; the fiction, although significant, is largely ancillary.

The derivative vocational role, however, is not one but many and complex, namely, that of the priest who is the engineer of the sacraments, who controls the floodgates of grace, who in dress and manner and tone of voice conforms to a compelling and distinctly puritanical pattern of aloofness and other-worldliness; that of the prophet who today is far less successful than the priest inasmuch as the events he foresees are usually more ably handled by Maurice Hindus, Kaltenborn, or the Whaley-Eton news service, and the events he would influence are more effectively directed by men who can hand out billions or give orders to a Gay-Pay-Oo. Then there is the less popular derivative Gandhian and monkish role of being the living sacrifice; and then the increasingly less successful role played by those who would be the moral judges of our life and time, and by those again who would be the teachers, the authorities on matters of religion and morals. All these roles —the priest, the prophet, the monk, the judge, the teacher—although distinct in theory are in practice inseparable. He who plays the one will be compelled to no small degree to play the others, and the social difficulties that will plague the attempt in a world as complicated and chaotic as the one we now witness will inevitably lead to a reappearance of the difficulties ministers once experienced in trying to be scientists. Thus the ministry is driven to look for a more than superficial interpretation of the vocational role in which society casts the profession.

I propose now that we make an attempt at re-thinking this role and the theory, be it fact or fiction, best suited

Pharisees is easily illustrated by the one fact that in our common vocabulary the term "Pharisee" has become identified with "hypocrite," with a "holier-than-thou" charlatanism, and with spiritual dishonesty.

It may be said very briefly and without fear of effective contradiction by anyone at all familiar with religious history that the picture of the Pharisees as presented in the New Testament is at the best only a partial picture and that to base a judgment of the great movement known as Pharisaism upon this incomplete, if not highly prejudicial, picture, is to be guilty of gross injustice and of unpardonable incompetency. Without in any way attempting to impugn the motives of the gospel writers or the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, it remains a fact, easily established by recourse to reliable data and documents of history, that the Pharisees were among the most loyal, the most devoted, and most sincere religious leaders of whom history has any record. They were active centuries before Jesus lived, and by the time the great Galilean had arrived upon the scene, they had already and to a remarkable degree done their magnificent work which was to assure the survival of Israel as the people of the Covenant, as the children of the Divine Law, as the bearer among the nations of the torch of ethical monotheism, of the Unity of God and of the Brotherhood of Man. They were in the glorious tradition of Ezra and the Sopherim, of the Hassidim, and of all those heroic souls who were ready to live and die for the Torah and for the glory of historic Israel. Judaism owes them a tremendous debt, and so does Christianity, whose central figure, Jesus of Nazareth, taught fundamentally what the Pharisees throughout the centuries had taught regarding the heart and soul of true religion; and was it not a Pharisee whom Jesus so emphatically commended for his evaluation of the "Great Commandment"?

Of course, the Pharisees were human and fallible; of course, they erred in their zeal; of course, they went to extremes; but to admit this is simply to make an admission which in its wider scope applies to the leaders of organized religion everywhere and at all times. Would Christians today call their own priests and preachers "hypocrites" because these exact of them certain observances, because they lay upon them the obligation of rite and ceremonial?

When Jesus uttered his famous denunciations of the Pharisees of his day, he was correct in so far as there were Pharisees of the type that he denounced; and be it known that there have been no severer critics of dishonest and unworthy Pharisees than the Pharisees and rabbis themselves, as anyone acquainted with Jewish history may know for the reading. If, however, Jesus meant his indictment of the Pharisees as found in Matthew 23 to be taken literally as condemning all Pharisees and all of Pharisaism, it can only be countered that in this instance the young rabbi of Nazareth not only showed poor insight into the nature of Pharisaism but also violated the high precepts of love, kindness, and forgiveness which he so emphatically proclaimed as the very heart of his message.

Much would be gained if only Christians would realize that by taking the gospel-picture of the Pharisees without qualification and supplement they get at the best a caricature, and an ugly and most prejudical one at that; if they only would understand that neither the demands of their religion nor the truth of their theological position can in any way be served by misrepresenting the opposition, but that, on the other hand, a truthful and accurate picture of the Pharisees is necessary both for a fair estimate of ancient and present-day Judaism as well as for a complete understanding of traditional Christianity itself.

The New Testament record of the Pharisees is an excellent example of "special pleading," of *ex parte* arguing. In their eager attempt to glorify their Master and to exalt his message, the writers, quite humanly and naturally, fell into the common error of painting his opponents and their teachings in as black colors as possible. In this they did what religious propagandists have always done, are still doing, and very likely will always do, and one does not in any way qualify the authority or spiritual power of these early Christian records by recognizing this very human element in their composition. However, for us of later and better informed generations to identify ourselves with every detail of their theological position to the extent of sharing their every prejudice and animosity is to be not only backward, unhistorical, and unscientific, but also to be lacking in that spiritual vision and understanding that comes with larger experience, with expanding perspective, and with growing wisdom. The Christian of today who is willing to judge the Pharisees of Jesus' day by the same standards employed by the primitive Christians, lays himself open to some very unpleasant experiences. Since he is satisfied to judge the Pharisees solely by the testimony of their enemies and detractors, how will he feel towards those of his generation who assume a similar attitude towards his own religion?

Does the Protestant, for instance, wish to be judged by non-Protestants or anti-Protestants? Will the Catholic be satisfied to have his faith represented and interpreted by non-Catholics, or even by anti-Catholics? How would the adherent of any theological or philosophical system like to make his opponents the chief, if not the sole, spokesmen for his views and convictions? Yet this is precisely what the Christians of all ages down to this day have been doing regarding the Pharisees, and the result has been confusion, suspicion, prejudice, and ill will. It is unscientific and prejudicial attitudes of this type that produce such unmannerly and inexcusable conduct as that of those who speak irreverently of the Catholic clergy, who refer cynically to Protestant clergymen as "Elmer Gantrys," who call church people "hypocrites," and who use a term like "politician" as synonymous with "crook and scoundrel" or a name like Shylock as synonymous with "Jew." The daily speech of religious people is full of such irresponsible and irrelevant generalizations; our Christian vocabulary abounds in such easy-going slander and innuendo, worthy only of the unthinking and uncritical and never serving a good purpose.

It is time that Christians learned the truth about the Pharisees, and the truth can readily be established. This would serve not only the purpose of better understanding and finer appreciation between Jew and Christian but would also meet the simple requirements of historical accuracy and of fairness. Let us remember that neither the stature nor glory of our great Master, nor the truth of his gospel, requires that we cast aspersions upon the Pharisees of the past or upon their descendants, the Jews of today, our fellow men, our fellow Americans; nor does the truth of our religion or the sincerity of our convictions gain one iota by childish attempts to depreciate any other religion or by cheap efforts at demeaning the teachers and leaders of another faith.

Arthur L. Weatherly and Nebraska State Government

ADDISON E. SHELDON

The history of Nebraska divides locally into four large sections: (1) Pre-historic, going back more than 1,000 years; (2) romantic exploration, from Coronado in 1541 to the scientific surveys of Lieutenant Pike, Lieutenant Fremont, and Francis V. Hayden in 1857; (3) pioneer settlement, from 1854 to 1890; and (4) social and political revolution, from 1890 to the present time.

The year 1890 is a dividing line in national as well as Nebraska thought. It ushered in the Farmers' Uprising. It presented a political and social program, denounced and derided by its opponents; later adopted in large degree by all political parties; and today the theoretical foundation upon whose principles the experimental development of our industry and thought is proceeding.

In Nebraska the initial period of vindictive controversy over the new thought presented by the Revolution of 1890 reached a termination in 1907 with the election of George L. Sheldon as governor and the adoption by the Republican Party, in large part, of the Populist program proposed at the national convention of that party, July 4, 1892. The Bryan Democracy had already adopted the main principles in 1896. The Populist party hung its washing out on the clothesline. William J. Bryan and Theodore Roosevelt stole the washing after dark and arrayed themselves in its garments.

The year 1907 in Nebraska marks the end of violent party antagonism to the new thought. It marks the beginning of the far more difficult program—that of definite, detailed setting up and operation of the new principles of political life in actual practice. Dr. A. L. Weatherly came to Lincoln in 1908 just in time to find his place as a leader in the new itemized scheme of putting into practice the general principles of people's government and people's interest in this state.

The first steps in the new program of popular government were the democratization of government itself. Toward this end the Australian ballot had been adopted in 1891 and the Direct Primary Act passed in 1907. In the immediate battleground when Doctor Weatherly came here were equal suffrage for women; the initiative and referendum; popular election of United States Senators; and non-partisan election for judicial and educational offices.

Each of these points in the democratic program was fought for through a series of campaigns. The fiercest fight was for woman suffrage, defeated in 1914 by a majority of 10,000 votes; fought through and incorporated in the new constitution of 1920.

The aim of the reformers in this period of developing Nebraska state government was to secure wider extension of popular election combined with simplified machinery for enforcing the popular approvals. A Unicameral Legislature was part of this program, defeated in repeated efforts; finally adopted in 1934 and constituting today one of several outstanding forward features of Nebraska state government.

One of the effective aids in this program of political information was the Legislative Reference Bureau, created by the legislature on April 7, 1911, and continued in various forms until abolished by the legislature in 1941. A series of reports and publications of this bureau furnished in convenient form the basic literature for the farm program.

Many different and detailed changes were made in Nebraska statute and constitution during this period. Among the most important was the adoption of the first Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation in Nebraska. This was a new idea in Nebraska. A special commission of seven well-known Nebraska citizens was appointed to study and report a proposed act to the legislature. I was secretary of that commission, but the great work of digesting the data and organizing the idea was done by Dr. A. L. Weatherly.

The enactment and subsequent amendment of the law in that field is one of the landmarks of Nebraska industrial life in the last thirty years.

The rivalry and the contest between private and public ownership of public utilities is a large and ramified battlefield of these years. We have to recall that in this period transportation in Nebraska was revolutionized by the transition from the old dirt-graded road created by the labor of the local farmer with plow, scraper, and spade, to the modern paved highway controlled by a centralized State Highway Department. The few limited lines of telephone went through the evolutionary forms of a multitude of local telephone companies seeking connection with each other through temporary devices, until transformed into the present consolidated state-wide and beyond-the-state telephone organization. The transmission of electric light and power by wire, from its few faint beginnings in our state, went through the processes of early local electric light and power plants, each operated by its little local company, to the present status of hydro-electric power organized into one association governing the entire state (with exception of Omaha), and marching forward toward the most complete integration of all electric light and power in Nebraska under one control.

The great changes in Nebraska state government since 1890 may be roughly classified under the following headings:

1. Extension of suffrage and popular control of state government.
2. Public ownership and state control extending to transportation in all its forms, including roads, power, lighting, air, and radio.
3. State control of labor and capital relations, accident and damage relations, and other aspects of the industrial machinery of production in Nebraska.
4. Extension of state and national control to agriculture in Nebraska by means of scientific direction, police protections, financial loans, and crop programs.
5. Child and social welfare programs to secure better protection and education of children and scientific care for mothers and those disabled; direction of youth through voluntary and other associations; and, in general, assumption by the State of a more definite parent relation to children.
6. A state health program covering the whole range of life, from human beings to hens, looking to the elimination of disease and the creation of health conditions for all living beings.

I am mindful that much of this program has been going on with the aid of federal officers and federal finances. I am mindful that the burden of this vast program resting upon the tax-payer has created much

misgiving in the mind of the public regarding the future of the state and the individual in society. I do not argue the desirability of every item in this program of the past forty years. In that part of the work here in Nebraska which is familiar to me in all its phases, Dr. A. L. Weatherly has been one of the most intelligent, persistent, productive leaders toward the achievement of the changed conditions under which Nebraska exists today. This achievement includes better living for the masses, better aims in private and public thinking, better foresight to meet the changes which invention in the fields of machine and methods has been forcing upon the life of humanity in all sections of the New World toward which this planet is moving.

The Study Table

"Dr. Will" and "Dr. Charlie"

THE DOCTORS MAYO. *By H. B. Clapesattle. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.* 812 *pp.* $3.75.

This book attempts to tell the story of three great physicians: William Worrall Mayo, and his two sons, William James and Charles Horace Mayo. The famous Mayo Clinic, known and honored throughout the world, is the lengthened shadow of these three men. Their work, their lives, and their contribution to the science of medicine make one of the most distinctive and significant contributions of America. Their work was so vast that it will take more than one generation to tell the complete story. While they lived, the sons, affectionately known as "Doctor Will" and "Doctor Charlie," would not permit a biography to be written, but they knew that their work belonged to the public; so before their deaths in 1939, they gave permission to the University of Minnesota to use the sources necessary to a compilation of the story. There is romance enough connected with the beginning of the Clinic to warrant the telling and retelling of the story. America's frontier is here; the dramatic story of the cyclone that destroyed the pioneer village in 1883, with the "horse and buggy doctor" coming to the rescue, is too vivid to be forgotten. But what is still more important is the determination of the Mayos to make surgery and medicine strictly and entirely scientific. Nor should the humanitarian side of the Mayos' work be forgotten. Those who were too poor to pay received as accurate and careful attention as the millionaires. The simple goodness of the original doctors has remained, and today the Mayo Clinic is mentioned with greater respect and affection than any other institution in America. As time goes on, the story of the Mayo Clinic will be told and retold and its glory will continue unabated.

C. A. HAWLEY.

"Science Is Not Neutral"

THE SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE. *By C. H. Waddington. New York: Penguin Books, Inc.,* (41 *East* 21*st Street*). 25 *cents.*

Please do not turn up your nose when you note the price of this extremely important book. Some reviewers will not consider a book if it costs less than two dollars. Do not let the price fool you—this is more valuable for the average man or woman than many four-dollar books.

If you are interested in a better world after this war you had better read this little volume. Professor Waddington of Christ's College, Cambridge, discusses the general aims and ideals of our civilization.

> This is a war, we are told, for Civilization and against barbarism. Probably both sides have said that about all wars. It will only be true when we say it, if we take steps to see that it is so. . . . Winning the war has not much meaning, except in a purely military sense, until we know what we want to get out of it.
>
> Human nature [everywhere] is plastic, and can be shaped by society either for good or ill. . . . The true, or at least the most important task of the cultural worker is to reveal to man the spiritual riches, which would result from the full exploitation of the immediate practical possibilities.

Well, those brief quotations from the first two chapters will give you a taste. Other chapters are: "On Whose Side Is History?", "Science Is Not Neutral," "Living in a Scientific World,"—ten chapters in all. When you come to the chapter: "Is Communism Science?" please read to the end before you decide Waddington is a communist and not worth reading. This is a very intelligent and critical analysis.

It is printed on terribly cheap paper, but do you buy a book for the paper, or for the thought that hits your brain like a dive bomber?

JAMES M. YARD.

The Return to the Church

NO SIGN SHALL BE GIVEN. *By Hugh S. Tigner. New York: The Macmillan Company. 198 pp. $1.75.*

This book is filled with the reflections of a minister for whom the sight of an abandoned church in the Pleasant Valley community of New York state became an unforgettable experience and the symbol of a world tragedy. Why are there so many abandoned churches? Why is Protestantism so weak and disorganized just when it needs strength to minister to the needs of a suffering world?

There is no spiritual equivalent for the church in our time. Its story is the story of continuity through change. "Our fathers were not keeping a charnel house, nor cherishing something that hampered their potentialities for great achievement. They were, in fact, preserving a heritage that made great achievement possible."

But great achievements are based on patterns and persuasions which come through the experience of the past. Permanence and change do not stand in isolation, for each conditions the other; and the author suspects that the contemporary objection to "indoctrination" is not a new and greater faith, but a greater doubt and confusion. And for such a condition a policy of "no indoctrination" is no help at all.

Neither is the abandonment of churchgoing, to be justified on any such grounds as, for example, are suggested by the "species Pollock-i." Church attendance suggests and promotes a needful sense of the togetherness "in God and before him." It provides the "edifying word"; it dramatizes the sense of traditional continuity, and makes real the spirit of fellowship. The church will not perform miracles and signs, but it is needed to promote piety, to rekindle hope, to perpetuate the reformation. Moreover, the church stands on the threshold of a new phase in her history, the drawing together of sects now that the process of sectarianism has run its course. Tigner believes that the many groups hold "more in common than in difference," and that they "face a common enemy in the age we are now entering."

But the observation thus stated reflects an omission in the author's argument which is conspicuous throughout the book. For whereas Tigner pays his respects to the problem of change, his emphasis is on continuity, "continuity in change," rather than the necessities and techniques of change "in the age we are now entering." What kind of church would the author offer the people of Pleasant Valley in the place of the church they abandoned? He does not say. The implication seems to be that, what with the Judeo-Christian tradition and other advantages he mentions, they simply ought to return. All of which makes the book an exhortation to the reader to return to the old faith, rather than an invitation to a new and liberating approach to the meaning of life and the inspiration of religion.

Such a book would be hard to write but exhortation alone will not bring the people back into the Pleasant Valley Church; neither will it unite the varying theologies of traditional Christianity into a vigorous and heroic faith.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

A Practical Gospel

METHODISM HAS A MESSAGE. *By Paul B. Kern. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 188 pp. $1.75.*

The author of this book, Bishop Paul B. Kern, will have historic importance as one of the leaders in the movement to unite Methodism which culminated three years ago in the great conference at Kansas City. Now that the Methodist Church has more than eight million members, what is its message to a distraught and weary world? The Methodist Church has no great body of theology as has the Presbyterian Church, but Bishop Kern sums its eclectic theology succinctly and well in these words: "At our best we are ambassadors of God, pleaders for reconciliation, ministers of the mystery of grace, and mediators of a redemption in his Name that is above every name."

Methodism, according to Bishop Kern, came close to the great Reformation theology in that it "preached a doctrine of salvation by grace." And again: "Wesley himself admits that 'the true Gospel touches the very edge of Calvinism.'" Calvinism, of course, is a restatement of Augustine and St. Paul. Methodism has held to the freedom of man's will which "cannot be overwhelmed by an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God." Here we get into philosophical problems which end in epistemology and in the paralysis of human thought. But Methodism always held to the practical, the pragmatic Gospel: Act as though it were true and you will find that it is. The Methodist Church with its social gospel can be a great power in remaking the world. With leaders like Bishop Kern this will be done.

C. A. HAWLEY.

New Wine in Old Bottles

THE LORD'S PRAYER. *By Ernest Fremont Tittle. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 127 pp. $1.00.*

What is the secret of greatness in contemporary preaching—or how is one to measure it? Ernest Fremont Tittle has had so much recognition as a writer and preacher that he would have to be included in almost any circle of America's outstanding preachers. His latest book contains eight chapters, each of which deals with a basic petition expressed in the Lord's prayer; and it is astonishing how much solid meaning he has put into such concepts as the Kingdom of Heaven, the heavenly father, daily bread, and forgiveness. Every chapter reveals the author's deep religious insight.

Even so, one who has abandoned the old patterns of religious thought and expression cannot sit down comfortably and read such a book. Understanding and wise in dealing with the problems of modern life, Doctor Tittle couches his every thought in language which the medieval saint or the modern fundamentalist would, in most cases, accept uncritically. He speaks, for example, of the different ways in which one can think of God: in mechanical terms, in biological terms, in social terms, and so forth. However, "if we speak of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we may at least be sure that we are thinking of God in terms of the greatest and best that we know." One might reply, of course, that that depends largely on one's conclusion regarding Jesus.

One might quote at random from any chapter or page to illustrate a familiar homiletic technique which has produced distinguished ministers in our age of theological transition. But it seems not unfair to point out that a too conservative phrasing of modern religious thought has been a liability rather than an asset, and has alienated some people from the churches. Someone will have to win them back; and he will have to speak a language different from that which is employed in this book. It is questionable, to say the least, whether modern man, uninspired by the church, and perplexed with many things, is helped a great deal with the assurance that "our Heavenly Father" has "in Jesus Christ revealed to us the standards and principles which should govern our conduct."

Here, then, is a method of expression which many people regard simply as empty words devoid of consolation because they are devoid of solid meaning. It goes without saying that to the author of this book they are not devoid of meaning. His is not a narrow conception of God, or of the Kingdom of Heaven, or of the problem of providing daily bread. He has long been in the forefront of the social struggle, and he has the courage of his convictions.

For all this we honor Doctor Tittle; but we recommend his book only with strong reservations. We wish it were written in a language which the disillusioned and the uninitiated could more easily understand and more readily accept.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

The Eternal Quest

GRANITE FOR GOD'S HOUSE. *By Doran Whalen. New York: Sheed and Ward. 366 pp.* $3.75.

Orestes A. Brownson, born in 1803, was one of the New England group that represented the shifting currents of the nineteenth century and its preoccupation with religion. Brownson was the least conspicuous of the entire group and in no sense to be compared to Emerson or any of the Concord group. Brownson's early life was harassed by poverty, and he had few advantages of a formal education. His was the eternal quest. His constant changes of religious affiliation earned for him the description, "a commonplace book of theology." When he was not concerned with various churches he gave his attention to socialism, labor groups, and other panaceas. Part of his life he spent

as a Presbyterian, then as a Universalist, later as a Unitarian; then he organized his own church, the Society for Christian Union and Progress. After a time he fell under the influence of other proselytizers and finally went into the Church of Rome. He was unhappy and misunderstood there, also, but death caught him before he had time to change again. He passed into oblivion immediately after his death in Michigan in 1876. His literary contribution was slight, but he left many letters and controversy enough to call forth this biography, the title of which is an excellent example of irony.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Manual of the American Way

LET'S TALK IT OVER! *By Leonard P. Aries. Chicago: Willett Clark & Co.* $1.00. (*Also, this book may be obtained from the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews, 203 N. Wabash Avenue, Chicago.*)

This Teachers Manual should be used widely by teachers in all schools, church and public. It would be useful for any discussion group. It is not a textbook.

It is for discussion leaders who are interested in promoting better human relations. Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick in the introduction says: "This Manual is a sign of a new educational outlook. But more than a sign, it is itself an instance of a new way to teach."

It deals with the following very timely subjects, "What Is an American?" "Propaganda and Its Analysis," "Refugees," "Prejudice and Understanding," and "What Can We Do in a World of Crisis?"

The fundamental philosophy of this Manual and of the Seminars that compose it is the thesis that freedom and the search for truth are the basis of the American way, and that any movement of hatred is anti-democratic and any anti-democratic movement is anti-the-American way.

This Manual is not an experiment. It grew out of Mr. Aries' experience over a period of two years, during which time he has conducted more than one hundred sessions in the high schools of Chicago.

These Seminars have met with an excellent response from both students and teachers. They are still going on. In one school, at the urgent request of the principal, Mr. Aries has given the series four times.

JAMES M. YARD.

Trumpets on New Horizons

EDITED BY LUCIA TRENT

Socks

"Ah's got mo' than one wish in mah heart an' mah haid—
An' ah's gwine ter wear socks before ah is daid."

But life is narrow when purse is thin,
And ambition a galling might-have-been,

Your heart is a net with broken mesh
And your head a sieve that is pawned by flesh.

"A silk shirt am grand, but mah heart am clean.
It's mah feet ah'll cover; de earth am so mean."

But earth is so jealous she will not let
A man stand up who was born to sweat
(Nor for more than a moment may he forget).

But no one is born a forfeit to toil.
It's not earth is unfair to those hued like her soil.

* * * * *

"If ah has done wrong and it caint pass by,
Jus' lemme wear socks befo' ah die."

Feet that were pierced by a Roman spike
And these black, now stockinged, lead on alike.

Naked they stopped on the scaffold stair,
These feet that to earth were always bare
(One scapegoat pays for the guilt all share)
But in socks they stepped on the empty air.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

Little Chinese Children

Little Chinese children, left alone in the world
By Jap bombers, live in thatched huts on the hillside,
Eating bark of mulberry trees and leaves of plants,
Or they move like uprooted trees from hill to hill,
Whimpering as they rove, and their pleading hands
Are raised in prayer: "Give us a world without war!"

Little Chinese children move around the hillside:
The shades of the amber night stir their memories
Of the rock gardens and the vegetable beds,
Of rice field terraces that climb up to the hill,
Of purple flowered bean plants along the river banks,
Of sampan boatmen who churn the yellow water.

Little Chinese children no longer shoot marbles;
They no longer walk on stilts, imitating
The old-time stilt dancers of an ancient China;
They no longer skip after an elusive football;
They no longer play with hoops, the Chinese children
With the *shino bien tze* we call pigtails.

Little Chinese children live again through terror;
They whimper or they sob or they cry for the homes
They will see no more, and for their fathers and mothers
Who have mounted the back of a dragon and gone
Far away into the yellow sky of the Ninth Moon
For a long and peaceful journey, never to return.

CLEM GRAHAM.

To a Nazi Soldier

(After reading of the atrocities in Soviet Russia)

Nazi soldier, there she stood
Out in the starry snow
And through her sobs she pled with you
To let her mother go.

Nazi soldier, there you stood
Out under frozen skies.
How could you kill this little one
With Jesus in her eyes?

LUCIA TRENT.